

Central office tower is center of controversial state government office center

Charges fly, work stops on 44-story office tower

Bethlehem Steel Corp. last week filed a \$1-million suit in Albany Supreme Court against Foster-Lipkins Corp., Great Ncck, N.Y., charging it, as general contractor, with building out of plumb the core of the 44-story central office tower in the state's \$750-million South Mall government complex now under construction in Albany. Bethlehem claims the improperly built core necessitated extensive steel changes.

Foster-Lipkins in turn lodged a \$5million counter suit against Bethlehem, the steel subcontractor, charging it with erecting the steel improperly and further accusing the building's architect, Harrison-Abramovitz and engineer Ammann & Whitney, both of New York City, with improper design.

The latest flurry of court action is an aftermath of Foster-Lipkins' head-on collision with the state earlier this month when the contractor lost by default its contract to build the tower.

Foster-Lipkins had accused the state of numerous delays on the project that had put it in an intolerable financial position. The contractor demanded payment of twice its bid of \$21.7 million to complete work on the building.

The state replied with an offer of \$100,000 in compensation. When the contractor failed to reply to the offer, the state cancelled the contract.

The state says the bonding companies must provide an acceptable replacement contractor, but it's possible the bonding companies may re-hire Foster-Lipkins or the state might call for forfeiture of the bond and seek a ncw contractor. ·

The 41-building complex, on a 98.5acre tract, has been plagued by political, financial design construction and from \$745 million to \$1.5 billion with that would labor problems and bad luck ever smc2002/05/09 on GLA-RDP86400244R00030002002822

Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller (R) proposed the project in 1959.

It took the state almost two years to work out a financial agreement with the city, permitting the state to build.

When construction on the project began in 1966, it ran into trouble because too much construction was scheduled in too little space. Contractors kept getting in each other's way, resulting in numerous early delays. The tight working quarters became even more crowded as the state started building an arterial highway system for the mall that helped increase the shortage of available labor.

To prepare cost estimates and coordinate the numerous contracts, the state retained George A. Fuller Co., New York City, as supervisor-consultant. However, headache upon headache piled up as some contractors didn't meet deadlines, thereby delaying others. Union jurisdictional disputes and strikes crippled the work schedule. To compound matters, the state kept enlarging its plans for the mall.

The contractors claimed that the delays were cating up their profit margins since costs were rising at a rate of 10 to 12% a year. At Governor Rockefeller's urging, the legislature gave the state power to reimburse contractors that could prove extra costs incurred through no fault of their own.

In 1962, the estimated cost of the project, on the basis of 3.2 million sq ft of office space, was \$250 million. After the project came off the drawing boards, the figure jumped \$400 million with completion set for 1967.

Now already three years off target, the project's total cost is estimated at

Illinois probes charge that consultants paid for state wg

The Illinois attorney general i vestigating charges that consulfin gineers had to make political kick to get highway work under the pre state administration. At the same a three-man ad hoc committed of t linoik Society of Professional/Eng (ISPE) is looking into why a south linois\consulting firm received a c contract from the state division of ways for 57% above the original estimate.

Robert Atkins, chief of the state trust division, says that nobod been charged yet with either soli payments from engineers or m payments to members of the pro state administration. Although h the state has been investigating for months the possibility that several have engaged in collusive practic declined to hame persons or firms the investigation is complete.

Leonard N. Crawford, of Crav Murphy & Tully, Springfield cons engineer, said that under the pr state administration his firm was cifically given the name of an in ual who had to be paid off if we w receive any state business. Our fit fused to pay off and therefore w awarded any lighway contracts. matter of principle and ethics, we to be a party to such practices."

Crawford, who is a past presid the Consulting Engineers Cour the U.S. and past president of linois Association of Consulting neers, said, It is a deplorable p that has existed in past Illinois ad trations and will exist\in the futu less legislation is passed or ad trative action is taken to control it

The ISPE investigation was pro by two articles in the st. LOUIS DISPATCH reporting that Hon Chastain and Associates Decat ceived \$630,000 to design a hi bypass/near Springfield when th enginers estimated design co \$400,000.

A spokesman for the firm, Chastain, said, "The Post-Dispa ticles hit quite wide of the man told them what the facts were, ar chosc not to believe them." Will Dart, executive director of Ispl there are indications that certain were left out of the original de that would account for the diffen